REMARKS

Claim Status

Claims 1-7 are currently under consideration. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that it is both the embossing and calendaring steps are responsible for the relative increase in caliper. Support for the amendment is found at page 11, lines 15-19 of the Specification.

Claim 1 has also been amended to clarify the basis to which lotion transfer is measured. Support for this amendment is found on p. 9 (Example) and p. 10, lines 11-14 of the Specification.

It is believed these changes do not involve any introduction of new matter. Consequently, entry of these changes is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

Claims 1-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph for failing to provide enablement. The Applicants are confused as to the reason for the rejection because the claims simply recite, *inter alia*, steps of a method. The Office Action argues that the specification "does not enable [any person skilled in the art] to make and/or use the invention commensurate with these claims." (Office Action dated March 17, 2008 repeating the rejection of the Office Action dated September 27, 2007, p. 2). Applicants respectfully submit that, as amended, the claims now recite that it is the combination of the embossing and calendaring steps which are responsible for the relatively increased caliper.

In light of the current amendment, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph.

U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. As discussed above, Applicants note that the claims, as amended, recite that it is the combination of the embossing and calendaring steps which are responsible for the relatively increased caliper.

As a result of the amendment, the Applicants respectfully submit that the claim is now proper under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over U.S. Pat. No. 3,414,459 in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,702,571 and/or U.S. Pat. No. 5,990,377 and/or U.S. Pat. No. 6,352,700

Claims 1-7 have been rejected as allegedly being obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Pat. No. 3,414,459 (hereinafter "Wells") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,702,571 (hereinafter "Kamps") and/or U.S. Pat. No. 5,990,377 (hereinafter "Chen") and/or U.S. Pat. No. 6,352,700 (hereinafter "Luu"). This rejection is traversed on the ground that Wells in view of Kamps and/or Chen and/or Luu fails to satisfy the requirements for a showing of obviousness as established by Graham v. John Deere Co., 381 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966). The four Graham factors are: (1) the scope and content of the prior art; (2) the level of ordinary skill in the prior art; (3) the difference between the claimed invention and the prior art; and (4) objective evidence of nonobviousness. This set of criteria was affirmed in KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007).

As amended, Claim 1 recites, inter alia, the steps of: (1) passing two webs through an embossing nip such that at least a first portion of the web is fixably attached to at least a first portion of the second tissue paper web; and (2) applying a transferable lotion to the product wherein the product is adapted to transfer a first quantity of said transferable lotion upon **stationary contact** with a glass surface and transferring a second quantity of said transferable lotion upon **dynamic contact** with a glass surface, wherein said second quantity is **at least 5 times greater** than said first quantity.

Applicants respectfully direct the Office's attention to the fact that the primary reference cited (Wells) teaches embossing two plies separately and then adhesively attaching the two plies together (Wells, Col. 3, lines 59-73). Further, Wells contains no

disclosure to embossing the two plies at once, and then applying a lotion to the surface. Luu and Chen do not remedy this deficiency because Luu and Chen are directed to a lotionized tissue (Luu, Abstract; Chen, Col. 36, lines 7-29). Kamps is relied upon to provide an example of a "using reduced height elements [on] embossing rolls having high density of elements" (Office Action dated March 19, 2008, p. 5). Applicants respectfully direct the Office's attention to the fact that Kamps merely discloses a variety of embossing patterns, but does not contain any disclosure regarding the process steps which are claimed by the Applicants. In other words, Kamps does not provide any basis to which one of skill in the art could even begin to use as a starting point for practicing the invention as claimed.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the invention, as claimed, is nonobvious over the cited art. As a result, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 and 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Early and favorable action in the case are respectfully requested.

This response represents an earnest effort to place the application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as now claimed from the applied references. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of this application, entry of the amendments presented herein, and allowance of Claims 1-7 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By _____

Peter T. Nguyen
Registration No. 58,282
(513) 634-4268

May 14, 2008
Customer No. 27752